

REMARKS

2

UPON A

LETTER

TO THE

Author of the *Inquiry into the
Revenue, Credit, and Commerce
of France.*

Address'd to the LETTER-WRITER :

By C—— P—— Esq; F. R. S.

*Homine imperito nunquam quicquam injustius :
Qui, nisi quod Ipse fecit, nihil rectum putat.*

TER.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the *Oxford-Arms*,
in *Warwick-Lane.* M,DCC,XLII.

(Price Six-pence.)

REMARKS

UPON

J. H. T. B. R.

London of the
General Council of the
Church of England



Printed by J. Roberts, near the Old Bailey,
in the Strand, London, W.C.C.

LONDON

Printed for J. Roberts, near the Old Bailey,
in the Strand, London, W.C.C.
(Price six-pence)



REMARKS

U P O N

A Letter to the Author of the *Inquiry into the Revenue, Credit, and Commerce of France, &c.*

S I R,

FOR some time past I have been in Expectation of seeing your Performance publicly taken Notice of by the Author of the *Inquiry*; but I presume by his Silence he thinks it too mean for a Reply, and that he cannot more effectually shew his Contempt than by totally disregarding it. Whatever his Motives are for acting the Part he does upon this Occasion, my Zeal for Truth will not suffer me to look on *with Indifference*, and see an Attempt made to *mislead* the Publick on so important a Subject, by a Writer of your peculiar Vanity and Ignorance.

To consider fully and deduce the former and present State of the Power and Commerce of France from AUTHENTIC Accounts, is a Task not unworthy of the great Character you assume; and those who meet with this in your Title-Page, go from thence to your Letter with high Expectation: but how great is their Surprise, to find a Member of Par-

B

liament,

liament, at first setting out, trifling away two Pages in a low wrangling Criticism upon a Compliment!

For my own Part, so unsuitable a Beginning made me doubt whether you had not the Honour to shave a certain foreign Minister, who comes from a Part of the World where the Art of Complimenting is a principal Study; that you do serve him in some Capacity, I can have no Doubt at all: in order therefore to recommend your Performance to the Publick, you found it necessary to conceal your real Meanness under the Dignity of a borrowed Character.

I presume it is likewise by way of Mask that you pretend to take a Side in our domestic Divisions; if not, you are guilty of a most egregious Blunder in the following Instance, where intending a Vindication you publish a Libel. You discover that the Inquiry, tho' without any such Design in the Author, is by necessary Inference an Accusation of the late Minister, which you make out thus. *The Inquiry shews the French to be without any considerable Revenue, Credit, or Commerce; therefore it secretly reproaches the Minister for not attacking them.*

Pray, Sir, how can the Minister be reproach'd for not attacking the *French*, unless they had given him just Cause? And if they did, how can you justify him?

O, say you, *nothing so easy. I will shew by the present flourishing State of her Commerce, that she is too powerful to be attack'd.* So you first admit him to be guilty of a most criminal Forbearance, in order to justify him afterwards by proving him a Coward.

How cruel is Fortune! And how hard the Fate of that Minister indeed! to have his Conduct

duct more vilely misrepresented, and more miserably treated by such an Advocate as you are, than by the infamous Slanders of the most abandoned Libellers? I confess it moves my Indignation, that under false Colours, you shou'd make so base an Attack upon his Character, by insinuating Motives for his Conduct so unworthy of his Magnanimity, and so contrary to Truth; since it is notorious that the Proceedings of *France* during his Administration were always so guarded, that *Great Britain* never had a just Pretence for coming to an open Rupture with her; and, directed by superior Wisdom, his constant Aim was to procure and preserve Peace, the most valuable of all Blessings to a commercial Nation.

Without taking Notice of your Scurrility, which is an indisputable Mark of a low Writer, or of your Impertinence to the *Nation*, by which you idly expose your *recreant Carcass* to a severe Chastisement, I proceed to examine your Objections; but in order to shew their *real Force*, it is necessary to state the general Plan and Argument of the *Inquiry*, at least, in the Light they appear to me in.

The Author lays down this general Proposition, That *France* in the present Situation of her *Finances, Credit, and Commerce*, is less powerful than she was Threescore Years ago. To prove it, he states the Revenues from a *French* Author of Reputation. He then observes, that the Regent by cancelling almost Three Fourths of the publick Debts, had destroy'd *Publick Credit*. In the last place he gives you a View of the Manufactures of *France*, under three different Periods. 1. Encreasing, till they with the other Commodities of the Kingdom, were exported to the annual Value of 6,750,000*l. Sterl. per An-*

num. 2. He shews in what Manner *England* and *Holland* came to rival *France* in her principal Manufactures. 3. *France* in some Degree recovers her Commerce, and in some Articles extends it. These Articles are pointed out, but the Value of them is not computed, because of the Difficulty, if not Impossibility, of procuring such Accounts as can be depended upon.

After this, the several Manufactures transferr'd from *France* to *England* and *Holland* are enumerated and valued, from the *British Merchant* and *Burrish's Batavia Illustrata*: But, as these Articles are valued, and the others are not, the Author does not determine by that whether *France* upon the whole be a Gainer or a Loser, or whether the general Balance of Trade be more or less in her Favour; and under this Uncertainty the Matter would have remained, if Monsieur *Du Tot* had not furnish'd him the Means of coming at a general Conclusion, by stating the Produce of the six old Branches of the Revenue at two different Periods of Time, *viz.* 1683 and 1730, &c. The Livres of 1683 of 27 in the Mark of Silver, being reduced to the same Value with the present Livre of 49, 16 Sols in the Mark, there appears upon comparing the two different Products, a Deficiency of no less than 75 Millions of Livres, or 3 Millions *Sterl.* and upwards; and as Revenues depend upon the State of Commerce, the Inquirer from thence concludes, that the *Loss* to *France* by the Variation in her Exports to *Great Britain* and *Holland*, is far from being repair'd by the new Acquisitions and Extensions of her Trade since the Treaty of *Utrecht*. This great Deficiency in the Revenue concurring with the other Proofs mention'd in the Inquiry, demonstrates the general Proposition,

Proposition, *viz.* That *France* at present is less powerful than she was before or at the Time of the Revolution; but does by no means determine the exact *Quantum* of her Loss; nor has the Author pretended to this. In order to confute him, you have form'd a most admirable Argument, which will do you as much Honour at least as your Vindication of the Minister. You first admit the Account of the Revenues of *France* to be a just one, and do not contradict the Deficiency in the six old Funds, the Loss of Publick Credit, and the decay'd Condition of her Navy; and then, without perceiving the Absurdity, you endeavour to prove that *France* at present is more powerful, has more Resources, and enjoys a more flourishing Commerce, than she did before the Revolution. I might, upon this Occasion, apply to you what a celebrated Author said of such a Writer as you are; You neither understand what you wou'd confute, nor know what you wou'd establish.

The Author of the Inquiry has advanc'd, that the Power of *France* is diminish'd; the great Deficiency in the Revenue proves it, and the Abatement in her Exports to *Great Britain* and *Holland* accounts for that Deficiency. For the Satisfaction of the *English* Reader, the several Particulars in which that Abatement has taken place, are enumerated; and the only Thing in dispute is, whether the Valuation of them be just or not. As that is taken from Books long since publish'd, and of great Reputation, the Author of the Inquiry is by no means answerable for it: He is, indeed, for his Mistakes, such as rating Brandy formerly imported at 40*l.* per Tun, which is too much by one half; nor ought it to be rated at 40*l.* per Tun now, as you have
done,

done, as any one may be satisfied, by applying to the Importers, who pay only about 22 *l.* per Tun, prime Cost, at an Average: but then whatever Abatement this makes, may be compensated in the Article of Linen, which is rated at 700,000 *l.* per Ann. by the Author of the Inquiry, and by the *British Merchant*, Vol. 2d. p. 216, 217, at no less than 960,000 *l.* per Annum.

As to the Decrease in the Exports to *Holland*, it may be estimated thus. *De Wit*, in his Maxims of *Holland*, says, the general Exports of *France* amounted to 6,750,000 *l.* per Ann. as mention'd before, of which the *Dutch* took the greatest Part. Now, supposing that to be no more than 3,500,000 *l.* *Burrish* has shewn that the several Articles, the Exportation of which to *Holland*, is either ceased or abated, are in Value above Three Fifths of the Whole, or 2,100,000; and allowing 400,000 *l.* per Ann. to be the Value of those Articles still exported to *Holland*, there will remain 1,700,000 *l.* the Amount of the Decrease, with which the Author of the Inquiry does pretty nearly agree.

Now, Sir, if *France* had gained no new Markets for her Manufactures and other Product, the Value of her general Exports wou'd be just so much diminish'd, as the Decrease of her Exports to *England* and *Holland* amounts to: And supposing that to be Three Millions, more or less, yet it is not to be consider'd as a Diminution of the general Balance, which is the Difference betwixt the Value of the Exports and Imports; because if they are both diminish'd alike, the Balance will remain the same as before; and I presume it is for that Reason that the Author of the Inquiry has consider'd it only as a Loss to be made

made good to *France* by an Increase of her Exports to other Countries. That it is not yet made good, he has endeavour'd to prove. But you, by the Assistance of your Friends, and the absolute Power you exercise over your own Numbers, have made the Balance of Trade in favour of *France*, even greater than it was before or at the Time of the Revolution. I will venture to affirm, that if you had obtained from the Liberality of your Friends a Balance even six times as great as you have made it, your Account wou'd then have been just as authentic and satisfactory as it is now. Are you not ashamed, Sir, to obtrude upon the Publick your own Assertions, and the Conjectures of People unknown, for authentic Accounts, in a Case where Facts only can decide? To conclude this Point, if a great Decrease of Revenue, Consumption, and Circulation, be consistent with an Increase of Commerce and Power, then your Accounts and Balances may possibly be right; if the contrary be true, as it most undoubtedly is, then what Excuse have you for this most impudent Attempt to impose upon the Publick?

I come now to a more particular Examination of your Objections; and first, (p. 4.) you take Notice of a Difference made betwixt Pledges and Effects, and that Jewels are mention'd only as Pledges. It is certain they are both; but whether the King of *France* sells or pawns his Jewels, the Difference to his Finances will be inconsiderable. It is plain the only Distinction there intended, is betwixt *Credit* obtained upon actual Pledges, and *Credit* obtained upon the King's Faith; and that introduces a Passage which you have most miserably tortur'd, in order to draw from it what you call a *String of Contradictions*.

The

The Author there says, that the Duke of *Orleans* by cancelling Three Fourths of the Publick Debts had ruin'd all Publick Credit in *France*; but as it was reported some time before the Publication of his Pamphlet, that the Court of *France* had procured some Money to be advanc'd for a few Months, in order to make Remittances into *Germany*; and lest that shou'd be produc'd against him as an Instance of *Publick Credit*, he not admitting but supposing the Fact, attributes it to the *Personal Credit* of the Cardinal, which the Government, no doubt, made use of upon that Occasion: But tho' his Personal Credit be supported by his Punctuality hitherto, yet it grows less as he grows older, because when he dies it ceases. Pray, Sir, what Contradiction is there in all this?

Page 6, You tell the Author, that however difficult he may think it to estimate the Patience of an enslav'd Nation, it is pretty easy to be computed, and that he himself had done it without knowing it; and then you mention *Lewis's* Debts as the Estimate or Product of that Patience. I am afraid, Sir, you forgot to compute the Patience of your Readers, when you ventur'd to trouble them with such incomprehensible Jargon. Know then, that *Lewis's* Debts were the Product of his Credit, which in some Degree he preserv'd to the last; and that the Patience of his People can only be estimated by the Misery they suffer'd, which I leave you to compute, and not by the Money which the Government borrow'd from particular Persons. Not satisfy'd with this, you, in order more effectually to confound the Understanding of the Reader, tell him in the very next Page, that *the Monarch of France is Master of the whole Property of his Kingdom*. If he

he is, then with what Propriety can you talk of his being in debt to his Subjects, since, according to you, he must be Debtor to himself. But I beg Leave to assure you, Sir, that the Monarch of *France*, as absolute as he is, is not *Master of the whole Property of his People* : for however patient they may be under the Oppressions of the Government in some Instances, yet all Men are impatient to eat when they are hungry ; and therefore he must leave enough for their necessary Subsistence. If ever his Demands go beyond that Limit, the People will hide their Effects and Money, and the King will be obliged, in such a Case, to levy his extraordinary Tax by military Execution : when that happens, there will soon be an End of the so-much-boasted Power of that Monarch. But as you seem to be exceedingly pleased with your own Notions, you are determined not to quit the Track you are in ; and therefore in the following Page you take upon you to assert, in contradiction to History and common Sense, that “ the
 “ wisest Men in *England* knew that there was
 “ no conquering the Monarch of *France*, nor
 “ any such Thing as exhausting his Strength,
 “ while there was any Property or People left in
 “ the Kingdom”. *You then go on*, “ This be-
 “ ing sufficiently understood by *Gentlemen of*
 “ *Discernment and real Knowledge, (by which*
 “ *Words, I presume, you only describe yourself,)*
 “ you extremely discover your Weakness in
 “ troublinging us with the old thread-bare Asser-
 “ tions of the Imbecility of the *French* Crown.
 “ If you would have done this to purpose, you
 “ shou’d have shewn, Sir, that the *Absolute Pow-*
 “ *er* which *Lewis* had formerly over the People,
 “ is limited and restrain’d at present. This

C

“ wou’d

‘ wou’d have really prov’d the Diminution of
“ the *French* Power, &c.”

Thus, Sir, you lay it down as a Principle, that the more the People of *France* are enslaved, the greater the *French* Power: and as this is a favourite Maxim of yours, you again, Page 72, mention the absolute Power of the present King over his People, as an undeniable Argument of the present Power of *France*. If that Maxim is true in *France*, it is true in *England*, and every where; and yet the Strength and Power of *England* have always been thought to consist in her being free. Tho’ such political Maxims, Sir, might be despis’d in a Performance like yours, because of the manifest Insignificancy of the Writer; yet what *Chastisement* do you deserve, who have avow’d them, under the Character of a Representative of the People? And since the *Person* of a Member of Parliament is peculiarly protected by the Law of *England*, it is but proper you shou’d be made a publick Example of, for presuming to disgrace the *Character* by ill Manners, and render it odious to the People by Maxims of Slavery.

Page 9, You object to the Inquirer, for observing, that before *Colbert’s* Ministry, *France* was without Merchants, and without Shipping; the plain Meaning of which, and what must occur to every Man of Candour, is, that the Number of Merchants, and the Quantity of Shipping were inconsiderable. All the Edicts and Arrets for the Encouragement of Trade and Shipping, publish’d during *Colbert’s* Administration, are so many Evidences of it; and your Quotation from the *British Merchant* only confirms what is said by the Author of the Inquiry

a little afterwards, viz. *That Colbert quickly gave a new Direction to the Genius and Activity of his Countrymen. i. e.* He encreased the Number both of Merchants and Seamen ; and the Author, whose Opinion you quote as above, affirms that to be the Case. When ? Why before the breaking out of the first War in 1688, when *Colbert's* Measures had produc'd their Effect : But you seem to be sensible of the Weakness of this Proof, since afterwards, Page 47, you have Recourse to another. Having quoted the following Passage from *De Wit*, (in *English*,)

“ A List of the Manufactures and Commodities exported out of *France* into foreign Parts, especially into *Holland*, according to a Scheme presented to the *French* King, by the *Society of Merchants at Paris*”. You then address yourself to the Author of the Inquiry in the following manner ; “ This, Sir, might have satisfy'd you, that there were *Merchants* in *France*, the contrary to which you have thought fit to assert”. But here, Sir, instead of convicting the Inquirer of a Falshood, you unhappily discover your extreme Ignorance. If instead of trusting to a Translation, you had been capable of reading the Original, you wou'd have found the Word there used is *Marchands*. Now, Sir, permit me to inform you, that *Marchand* in *France* signifies a Shopkeeper, or a Retailer ; but those whom in *England* we call *Merchants*, are in *France* call'd *Negociants* : to be convinc'd of which, I refer you to *A Collection of Memorials presented by the Deputies of the Council of Trade in France, to the Royal Council in 1701*. And indeed it is somewhat strange, that notwithstanding a *three Years Continuance in France*, you shou'd not understand *one Word* of

her Language; and you seem to be no better acquainted with her History, which I think appears pretty evident by your Objection; as a final Answer to which, I will quote the following Passage from *Du Tot*. Vol. II. p. 333. “ Il y avoit en *France* alors beaucoup “ de Facteurs et de Commissionnaires des Negocians Etrangers, et tres peu de Negocians.” i. e. (it is for your sake I translate it, Sir,) “ At that time (in 1664, when Colbert established the East-India Company) there were in “ *France* a great many Factors, and People “ acting by Commission from foreign Merchants; and very few Merchants.”

In the next Page you make just as bad a Figure; for notwithstanding your Description of a Factor is extremely long, in order that nothing shou'd be omitted, you have unfortunately forgot half his *Business*, which is to buy as well as to sell; and those who were employ'd in *France* to buy upon the *Dutch* Account, were undoubtedly Factors to the *Dutch*, as well as those employ'd to sell. Now, after such egregious *Nescience* (they are Words of your own) do not you think the Airs you put on in the following Paragraph, make you appear extravagantly ridiculous?

“ I have dwelt, say you, longer on this than “ I designed; but I have done it for your Instruction, at the same time that I am giving you a seasonable Correction.” After this *seasonable Correction*, your true Genius appears (p. 11, & 12) in a most pitiful Cavil. Cou'd it be imagin'd, if three different Causes co-operated in ruining the Manufactures of *France*, that ever that *Ruin* shou'd be made the Effect of one only? But as you are greatly too

too low for further Notice in this place, I proceed to examine your Objections to the Author's Calculation of the Loss of Men during the two Wars, from 1688 to 1714. I have heard that the Proportion of One Fifth Loss was taken from the *English* Troops in the Confederate Army: and as the Confederates, except during the first Years of King *William's* War, were generally victorious, and consequently their Loss of Men not so great as in the Armies of *France*, who were not only oftner beat, but likewise much worse subsisted and paid, I believe the Computation of their Loss may be justify'd upon these two Articles only. Lost by the Sword, and by the Hardship of the Service, without including Desertion; for which Article you will allow no Loss at all: because, say you, "the *French* Soldiers either deserted from the *French* Troops to the Confederates, or back again into *France*." Sir, it is extremely improbable that the *French* Soldiers deserted back again into their own Country, where, by the Nature of the Government, it was almost impossible for them to be concealed. "And if they deserted to the Confederates, so did many of the Confederate Soldiers to the *French*: and these, *You say*, may be fairly plac'd against each other." Pray, Sir, who told you so? Can any Man believe that the Desertion was as great from the victorious Army as from the Vanquish'd. Besides, whatever Confederate Soldiers deserted to the *French*, were received into the foreign Corps, which are excepted out of the Calculation. The rest of your Objection deserves no Answer, and seems to have been made meerly for the sake of
of

of a most execrable Pun upon STANDING ARMIES, by which you wou'd demonstrate their Success in Propagation. Some of the most judicious of the *French*, and who are very well acquainted with the Condition of their Country, have own'd, that at the End of the late War, the able-bodied Men in the Kingdom were diminish'd One-Fifth: and as this was the Effect of a gradual Waste, and not of a sudden Destruction; therefore it does also infer a proportionable Diminution of the Aged and Children.

With your *usual* Candour, p. 15, you make the Author of the *Inquiry* directly charge the Regent with stopping Payment of the Bank-Bills; whereas he only insinuates a Fraud, which you yourself admit, as it seems, without knowing it; when in the same Page you tell us, "The true Case was, the immense Sum which "was emitted in Bank-Bills, was more than "the Cash, or Specie, in the Bank was able to "circulate, especially upon any extraordinary "Draught; so that the Bank being unable to "stand the Shock of the least *Panic*, was suddenly broke." Sir, whence did the *Panic* arise, but from a Suspicion of the Regent's Conduct; not of *Laws's*, who most certainly was both willing and able to support the Credit of his own Scheme, if the Direction of it had been left solely to him? And whence did that Deficiency of Specie, that Inability of the Bank, proceed, but from an Embezzlement of the Cash, which the *sudden breaking* is direct Evidence of? Here, Sir, you not only discover a gross Ignorance of Facts, but an absolute Incapacity of reasoning upon them.

The next Objection I meet with is, p. 17, to rating the Wines at 17*l.* 10*s.* per Tun. If you will look into the 1*st.* Vol. of the *British Merchant*, p. 318, you may there convince yourself, that by the Invoices from *Bourdeaux*, Wines cost 17*l.* 10*s.* per Tun at an Average, and that too in the Year 1668 : if it cost so much then, there is no Reason for supposing it cheaper any Year afterwards.

From Page 17 ~~to 42~~, besides repeated Instances of your matchless Arrogance, I find very little that deserves any farther Notice, than what is already taken of it ; until I come to Page 23, where you endeavour to shew the Author of the Inquiry inconsistent with himself, in fixing the Meridian of the *French* Greatness and Power in 1683, five Years after the Act prohibiting *French* Commodities took Place in *England* ; by which Act the *French* Commerce was considerably affected. Sir, without any Compliment, you are always consistent with yourself ; for here you either overlook Facts, or do not perceive the Consequences of them. Have you not, in the same Page, the following Quotation from the Inquiry ? “ In 1678, (the Year “ in which the Prohibition Act pass’d) *France* “ made the Treaty of *Nimeguen*, &c.” And are you to be told, that the immediate Consequences of that Treaty were, opening again a free Trade with the Empire, and a Renewal of her Commerce with the *Dutch*, who always, in time of Peace, were the greatest Buyers of ~~their~~ Manufactures ? Must I tell you too, that *Colbert* was still living, to improve the Advantages of that Peace, by encouraging the Trade and promoting the Navigation of *France* ? And do not those Advantages more than compensate

sate the Loss she might suffer by a Law ill observed in *England*? I admit that the Effects of the Act of Prohibition were *immediate and happy*; more especially with regard to our Woollen Manufactures, as is testify'd by Sir *Joshua Child*, and the Authors of the *British Merchant*; but they were neither so great nor so extensive as they might have been, owing to the great Influence the *French King* had then over *Charles II.* and his Ministers, who took care that the Officers in the Customs shou'd not be over-rigorous in putting the Act in Execution: for Proof of which I appeal to the Report of the Lords Commissioners for Trade 1697, from which you quote, Page 31, 32, the following Passage.

“ From *France* the Importations have gradually encreased from *Anno 1670*, to the Beginning of the late War, on *Wines, Brandys, Silks, Linens*, and many Sorts of other Goods; for though there was a Prohibition of *French Wines* during some of those Years, yet it was brought in under other Names; and in the same Years our Exports thither have decreased.”

The plain Reason why *French* Commodities were still run in upon us, was because our early Attempts in new Manufactures were incapable of supplying a Quantity sufficient for our Consumption: Besides, as the *French* knew their own Strength at our Court, they were in hopes of seeing that Prohibition taken off; which accordingly happened: and therefore they, no doubt, continued to make up Goods for the *English* Market upon that Speculation. Now, Sir, how unfair is it in you, to transfer the Estimate of the *French* Loss, computed by the Inquirer,

quirer for one Period of Time, and apply it to another ; when it is evident, the Situation of Affairs betwixt the two Nations was exceedingly different.

Tho' you have fail'd in this Objection, yet you are so fortunate, Page 48, as to detect an Error of no less than 180 *l.* in a Sum of 1,200,000 *l.* As there is nothing more easy than to reduce *French Money* into *Sterling*, this Mistake could not arise from any Difficulty in the Calculation : it must therefore be a mere Slip of the Pen in transcribing. But as great a Trifle as this may appear to be, you have thought proper to insult over it, with a great deal of Malignity, for above a Page. You then ask, *If the English and Dutch bought up all the French Silks, what remain'd for the Northern parts of Europe ?* Sir, they were supplied by the *Dutch*, who, at that time, had engross'd both the Navigation and Traffick betwixt *France* and the *North* entirely to themselves.

I come now to examine what you have done towards settling the present State of the Commerce of *France*. But in the first place I must observe, that this is only a Part of what you promise ; unless you take the Power of *France*, and the Balance of her Trade, to be one and the same Thing ; in which you will find yourself exceedingly mistaken. However, as the *French Commerce* justly deserves the Attention of *Englishmen*, and must be the perpetual Object of their Jealousy ; a State of it, founded upon AUTHORITY, wou'd certainly be acceptable to the Publick. Such a State of it I expected from you, upon reading the Title of your Pamphlet : but, upon looking into the

D

Accounts

Accounts you produce, I find myself most miserably disappointed. The *Accounts* formerly publish'd in the *British Merchant*, and which you now make use of to shew the Gain of *France*, by her Trade with *England* formerly, are the only Accounts which, upon any Pretence, you can call AUTHENTIC: and yet, whoever examines them, will find they all differ from one another, both in the Quantity and Valuation of Commodities; and that in order to determine the Balance of Trade betwixt the two Nations, Recourse is had to arbitrary Allowances for Goods run. These Allowances have been made with great Latitude: and if you consult the *British Merchant*, you will find the Balance of Trade, even as stated by *Fortry*, vindicated, upon a sufficient Allowance being made for Frauds in the Customs, and Goods smuggled.

The other *Accounts* rest solely upon your own Authority; and what Regard is due to that, will easily be determined, when you are known. In the mean time, they are of no Authority at all; and can give no Man of Business the least Satisfaction. Whoever considers what it is to give a true State of the French Commerce, and the Difficulties that must attend so extensive an Inquiry, can he help being surpriz'd to find it in such Hands, or laughing at the Impotency and Folly of the Attempt? But, as you pretend to have been ably assisted, it may not be improper to remark upon two or three Particulars, and then take a View of your general Plan. By the way, I look upon your pretending to be assisted on this Occasion, as the pure Effect of your MODESTY; and that this wonderful Achievement is intirely your own:

own: but rather than astonish the World with the Extent of your Knowledge, you thought proper to share it with your Friends.

In your Account of the present Imports from *France to England*, p. 42, you rate the prime Cost of *Brandy* at almost double what it ought to be; and the Quantity you assign for our annual Consumption, is too great by 5 or 600 Tun.

In your Account of the present Exports from *England to France*, p. 43, there is an Article of Goods exported to *Dunkirk*, valued at 40,000*l*. I must own, I am a little surpriz'd, that notwithstanding a *Three Years Continuance in France*, in which Time you made so many excellent *Observations*, you never observed *Dunkirk* to be a Free-port; and that Goods exported thither, are no more sent to *France*, than if they were exported to *Ostend*: since a great many Commodities are sent to *Dunkirk*, which are prohibited in *France*, or loaded with such Duties as amount to a Prohibition; and for that Reason are destin'd for some other Market.

In your Account of the present Acquisitions to the *French Commerce*, and their Amount, p. 54, there is the following Article:

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
In her Exports of Sugar, Me-	} 300,000	: 00	: 00
lassus, Rum ———			

I must take the liberty to inform you, that the *French* suffer no *Rum* nor *Melassus* to be imported from their Colonies into *Europe*, lest they shou'd interfere with their own *Brandys*; so that neither *Melassus* nor *Rum* can be reckon'd among the *Re-exports from France*. If, by the *Melassus* and *Rum* mention'd in this Article, you

mean what they sell to the *English Northern Colonies in America*; you may as well reckon the *Lumber* with which these Commodities are purchased, among the *Re-exports* from *Great Britain*; which is absurd.

The two Articles, *viz.* the *East-India Trade*, and *Increase of Shipping*, or *Freight* sav'd, making together 550,000 *l. Sterl.* are charged twice, if not wholly, at least for the greatest part. Almost the whole Article of *Freight*, and the greatest part of *East-India Goods*, come into her Account with *Holland*.

Now, if your *Dutch Friends* have stated the Difference of the former and present Balances betwixt *France* and *Holland* with any Exactness, those two Articles must be included: the same may be said of the *India Goods* sent formerly from *England*. You have therefore given *France* Credit twice for the same Sums.

These things I only mention by the way, as Proofs of the Judgment and Ability of your *Assistants*: but when the whole is of a-piece, it is needless to be more particular; I shall therefore take a short View of your *General Plan*.

By the several Accounts	}			
from the <i>British Merchant</i> , you determine				
the former Balance in				
favour of <i>France</i> to be		<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
		1,000,000	: 00	: 00
By your own Account the	}			
present Balance is —		221,900	: 00	: 00
And the Difference —				
		779,100	: 00	: 00

This Difference, you say, p. 45, is the whole Loss to *France*, by the different State of her former

mer and present Commerce with England: Be that as it will, yet it is not the whole Loss that *France* sustains by the different State of the Manufactures in *France* and *England*; and this is what you ought to prove, if you wou'd confute the Author of the Inquiry. The rest of your *Plan*, tho' attended with much greater Difficulties, you dispatch with infinitely more Ease.

With the Assistance of *two Friends*, you determine the Loss to *France*, by the Variation in her Commerce with *Holland*, to be 700,000 *l. Sterl. per Ann.* and with the Assistance of *one* only, you determine her additional Gains with all the rest of the World to be 1,760,000 *l. per Ann.* Finally, you determine, that the general Balance in her favour is 280,900 *l. per Ann.* more than it was at the *Revolution*; and then, with wonderful Gravity, you declare; *Thus have I settled the present State of the Commerce of France.* Sure this is the most extraordinary Attempt, that was ever yet made upon the Credulity of Mankind. What must be the Work of *many*, employ'd by Order, and back'd with the whole Power of the *French* Ministry, is here dispatch'd in the compass of a few Pages, by an insignificant, anonymous Pamphleteer, with the Assistance of one or two of his Friends.

That you should presume, upon the Strength of such Assistance, or a little Knowledge pick'd up at the Custom-house, to give a general State of the Commerce of *France*, and the Balance at present in her favour; does not surprize me more than your extreme want of Discernment, in mistaking that Balance, supposing it exact, for the true State of her *Power*: But since your Notions of Trade, and the Power resulting from it,

it, are exceedingly confus'd, I will take the liberty to offer a few Observations, in order to illustrate the Subject.

In the first place, the Difference betwixt the former and present Balance, is not precisely the Loss that *France* suffers by the different State of her Manufactures, and by the Variation in her Trade with *Great Britain*: for as that Variation is occasion'd principally by the shifting of Manufactures from *France* to *England*; *England*, besides her own Consumption, which is all that you take into your Account, may likewise supply her Neighbours with some Articles; such as Hats, Glass, Clocks, Watches, and Hard-ware, which they had formerly from *France*; and the Amount of those Articles, whatever it is, must be added to the Loss which *France* suffers; consequently the Diminution in her Balance with *England*, is not her *Whole Loss*.

In the next place, the Power of *France* does not rise and fall in exact Proportion to the Increase and Decrease of her general Balance of Trade: or, in other Words; The Balance of Trade is not the exact Measure of a Nation's Power.

To make this plain, I will put the following Case: Suppose the annual Exports of *France* to be 7,000,000*l. Sterl.* and her annual Imports 4,000,000*l. Sterl.* the Balance in her favour is 3,000,000*l. Sterl.* Suppose again her Exports to be reduced to 5,000,000*l. Sterl.* and her Imports to 2,000,000*l. Sterl.* the Balance, you see, is still 3,000,000*l. Sterl.* in her favour. But, with great Submission, the Power of *France*, in this Case, is diminish'd; because her Manufactures and Product are less by Two Millions, *per Ann.* consequently her Circulation and Labour

hour are less, as likewise her Consumption and Revenue.

Since the Difference of Balances does not exactly mark the Increase or Diminution of a Nation's Power : its true Estimate is to be taken from the Quantity of Labour, or the Number of People employ'd.

For Example : Suppose the Balance to be nothing ; but let the annual Exports and Imports of a Country, instead of one Million each, be increased to ten : it follows, necessarily, that that Country is increased in Power ; because the Ingredients of national Power are increased ; such as the Number of People employ'd, and the Quantity of Property in Circulation.

Notwithstanding these are self-evident Truths, and what must occur to every Man's Thoughts, who considers the Nature of Commerce with any Degree of Attention and Capacity ; yet they do not seem to have been at all perceiv'd by you, with all that *Knowledge and Discernment* you pretend to. However, having acted your Part, very much to your own Satisfaction, you design'd to have walk'd off the Stage here, if you had not been stopp'd by a *most egregious Passage*, p. 52, of the *Inquiry* ; where the Author calls the Balance of Power in *Europe*, the *Perpetuum Mobile* in Politicks. You may remember to have heard it often, for it is a very common Saying, That Comparisons do not run upon all-four ; it is enough if there is one striking Resemblance : and the Comparison here quoted, cou'd be intended only to denote a difficult Problem ; and to be sure the *one* has exercised the Statesmen, as much as the *other* has the Mechanists, and will continue so to do. But, if I am not mistaken, you had a more selfish Aim

Aim than you design'd shou'd be known. Having in another part of your Letter, very unfortunately for the late Minister, declared yourself his Advocate ; you take an Opportunity in this place, of making your court to * Two Persons of great Distinction, who are not his Friends ; and so discover the Baseness of the Metal you are made of, by meanly attempting to secure the favour of *one Side* at least, by a slavish Adulation to both.

Having thus artfully play'd the *Courtier*, your next Ambition is to make a figure as a *Philosopher* ; and how notably you acquit yourself, let the Reader judge, by the following Passage from pa. 56, of your Letter.

“ You have heard, Sir, I perceive, some-
 “ where, of the *vis inertiae* of Matter, and like-
 “ wise of its *Gravitation* : and, therefore, you
 “ have introduc'd them here both together, to
 “ shew your Learning ; and have consider'd the
 “ same Object, that is the *Dutch State*, as un-
 “ der a *vis inertiae*, and *gravitating* towards
 “ *France* at the same time : But, Sir, you are to
 “ be inform'd, that whenever the *vis inertiae* is
 “ mentioned by Philosophers, they understand
 “ it of a Body at rest, and this *vis* to be the
 “ Opposition it makes to being mov'd out of its
 “ place.

“ At the same time the Idea of *Gravitation* in
 “ a Body, is the Idea of its tendency to some
 “ other Body ; or, in short, the Idea of a *vis*
 “ *inertiae* of a Body, is, of its endeavouring to
 “ keep its place ; and the Idea of *Gravitation* of
 “ a Body, is, of its actually changing its place,
 “ or endeavouring to change it : And (*here*

* *Argyle and Stair.*

“ comes a Simile) you might as well have talk’d
 “ of a Dutchman *lying in his great Chair with*
 “ the Gout, and running a Race at the same
 “ time ; as of the *Dutch State* having a strange
 “ *vis inertiae*, and, at the same time, an unna-
 “ tural *Gravitation* towards *France*.”

“ But, Sir, (*say you*) I have not done with
 “ this Jargon yet ; for allowing you that there
 “ is a *Gravitation*, or, if you will, a *vis inertiae*
 “ in the *Dutch State* towards *France* ; which
 “ pitiful Allusion to the Heaviness of the
 “ *Hollanders*, I suppose, you intended for Wit ;
 “ yet now you have got these, you only ex-
 “ pose yourself worse than before, by *jumbling*
 “ *them together* ; and ridiculously tell us, that
 “ the *Newtonian Principle of Gravitation*, is
 “ impossible to be accounted for, but by the
 “ *Cartesian Vortices*.”

It is a strange thing, that People will be giving themselves Airs of pronouncing in a decisive Manner, touching things of which they must be conscious they are utterly ignorant. One naturally pities Ignorance, when it is attended by its decent Companion, Modesty ; but when it struts forward with an insolent Air, accompanied with Self-confidence, and a Censure of others, it is inexcusable, and deserves to be expos’d. Here, Sir, is so striking a Likeness, that one cannot help believing you sat for the PICTURE. The *Original* you may see, p. 26, of *A Full Answer to the Letter from a By-Stander*, just publish’d.

Having with much Labour brought two philosophical *Ideas* into the World, what pity is it, that one of them only should be right ?

You suppose it an Absurdity, that the same Object should be consider’d as under a *vis in-*

ertie, and *gravitating* at the same time ; but with great Submission, the *vis inertiae*, and *Gravity* are *constant Properties* of all Bodies ; therefore not inconsistent : and then, what becomes of your *Simile* of the Dutchman LYING in his great Chair WITH the Gout ? You say, whenever the *vis inertiae* is mention'd by *Philosophers*, they understand it of a Body at rest : You must certainly mean the *Philosophers* in *Moorfields* ; towards which Place you seem to have a *natural Gravitation* : for no *Philosopher* in his Senses, ever understood it of a *Body at rest only*, but as a constant Property of all Bodies, whether at rest, or in Motion ; as you may be convinc'd, by looking into the first Elementary Writer you meet with on the Subject. The pitiful Allusion, as you call it, to the Heaviness of the *Hollanders*, I allow to be so ; it is entirely your own ; as is likewise the Ridiculousness of saying, that the *Newtonian Principle of Gravitation*, is impossible to be accounted for, but by the *Cartesian Vortices*. This is nowhere said by the Author of the *Inquiry*, who only alludes to the *Cartesian Method* of accounting for all Appearances, by the Activity of their *Tourbillons* : and however false and unintelligible this may be in Philosophy ; yet, it may be applied in a political Sense, as is easy to be seen by any Man of Candour ; since no body can doubt of the Existence or Nature of the *Matiere Subtile* in Politicks.

Sir, it is your Misfortune, and I pity you for it, to be curs'd with a most impotent Desire of Fame. While you aim at being thought an Adept in every thing, you are constantly exposing your Ignorance in things the most common. In order to shew yourself a complete
Man

Man of Business, you enter'd into a tedious Description of a Factor, and unluckily forgot half his Employment. And here, out of mere Vanity to shine as a Philosopher, you labour to explain two well-known Properties of *Bodies*, and are so unfortunate as to be grossly mistaken in one of them.

Such Accidents ought to be an Instruction to you for the future, either to write with more Modesty, or, (which perhaps is wiser) not writing at all, to content yourself with the Applause of your own little Circle in Obscurity. But, if these shou'd not be sufficient, I will take the liberty to mention a third Accident; I call it an Accident, because I am sure you could not design it; and that is a trifling Blunder in Chronology. p. 58. you suppose the Act prohibiting *French* Commodities, to be in force, and *Jefferies* to condemn the Rebels with great Vivacity, at one and the same time. Now, you have observ'd in your Letter, that the Prohibition-Act expir'd the 16th of *June* 1685; and I will inform you, that *Jefferies* did not go his Circuit in the *West*, till the Month of *September* following: But you was ambitious to let the World know how very well read you are in the *English History*.

From Page 58 to 61, I meet with nothing but malicious Distortions of some Passages in the *Inquiry*, and pitiful Cavils; which, without ether weakening the Argument of the Author you attack, or fortifying your own, serve only to let the Reader see the true Size and Meanness of your Genius; and to render your pretending at the same time to Candour, extremely ridiculous.

The Author of the *Inquiry* having quoted the Inspector-General's Account of our Exports and Imports at two different Periods of Time, as representing the true State of our general Trade ; you are pleased to tell him, p. 61, *That he has stated those Accounts, as usual, without the least Judgment, or regard to Truth and Exactness.* This is, indeed, Language very unbecoming a Gentleman, and what only the lowest of Writers are guilty of ; and is a further Proof how much you are a Stranger to good Manners and good Sense. If those Accounts agree with the Originals given by the Inspector-General, which you cannot deny, then he has paid all the regard to Truth and Exactness, that the Case admits of ; and when you mention his want of Judgment in *stating* an Account, at the same time that it is truly *stated*, I am really at a loss for your Meaning. The Author's reasoning upon those Accounts, as upon an exact State of our Trade at those two Periods, is justify'd by the *British Merchant*, in five or six different parts of the Book : And the Gentlemen who wrote the Papers, which compose that Book, were eminent Merchants as well as *Englishmen* ; and in the true Interest of their Country. As for *Davenant*, the Inspector-General, he was, as you are now, a zealous Advocate for the *Power and Commerce of France* ; and therefore, one need not be surpriz'd, to find you agreed to discredit an Account, which shewed, that an open Trade with *France* was pernicious to *England*. But what Esteem he was in, as to his *Opinion*, you may see by the following Passage, *Brit. Merch.* Vol. II. p. 132, " He, (Dr. *Davenant*) may be a good Witness of a Fact, " yet, for his Opinion, it may be no better than another

“ another Man’s. For Example, in Page 46 of
 “ his Report, he says, that in the Year 1662,
 “ our Imports from all the World, exceeded our
 “ Exports 1,993,207*l.* 14*s.* *Sterl.* And in
 “ the Year 1668, our Imports exceeded our Ex-
 “ ports 2,132,864*l.* 18*s.* *Sterl.* Now, he is very
 “ likely to be a good Witness of these Facts, be-
 “ cause he is Inspector-General.” *But then he goes*
on to say, that “ in those Days no Man in his
 “ right Senses will deny that we carry’d on
 “ a very profitable Traffick. This is his Opi-
 “ nion: But I must affirm, that such a profita-
 “ ble Traffick, for many Years together, must
 “ have been the Ruin of the Nation.”

This, Sir, is the Opinion of a Writer, whose Judgment and Integrity can hardly be question’d. However, *Davenant*, to prove what he has advanc’d, produces from the Mint-Rolls, an Account of all the Money coin’d from 1659 to 1688, which, he says, was all owing to a superlucration of Bullion; and assigns that, as the Amount of our Gain by foreign Traffick in that Period. But, Sir, I would ask you, if the Coin of the *Rump*, &c. was not call’d in by the King’s Proclamation, soon after he was restor’d? If it was, then you must allow the Doctor to be so far out in his Computation, as the old Money re-coin’d amounted to. Be that as it will, I have an Authority to produce against the Doctor, to which I flatter myself you will form no Objection: and it is a Speech of Lord *Lucas*’s in the House of Lords, *Feb.* 22d, 1671, upon reading the Subsidy-Bill the second time, in presence of his Majesty: From which Speech I shall quote the two following Passages.

“ In the Times of the late usurping Powers,
 “ although great Taxes were exacted from us,

“we

“ we had then the Means to pay them : We
 “ could sell our Lands, our Corn, and Cat-
 “ tle ; and there was *plenty of Money* through-
 “ out the Nation : now there is nothing of this ;
 “ Brick is requir'd of us, and no Straw allow'd
 “ to make it with : For that our Lands are
 “ thrown up, and Corn and Cattle are of little
 “ Value, is notorious to all the World.

“ And it is as evident, that there is a Scarci-
 “ ty of Money ; for all the Parliament-Money,
 “ call'd *Breeches*, (as fit for the Coin of the
 “ *Rump*) is *wholly vanish'd*. The King's Pro-
 “ clamation, and the *Dutch*, have swept it all
 “ away ; and of his now Majesty's Coin (*N.B.*)
 “ there appears but very little ; so that, in ef-
 “ fect, we have none left for common use, but
 “ a little, old, lean, coin'd Money of the three
 “ late former Princes : And what Supply is
 “ preparing for it, my Lords ? I hear of none,
 “ unless it be of Copper Farthings ; and this
 “ is the Metal that is to vindicate, accord-
 “ ing to the Inscription on it, *the Dominion*
 “ *of the four Seas.*”

Now, if the Testimony of this noble Lord must be admitted upon this Occasion ; I should be glad to know what was then (1671) become of Dr. *Davenant's* Superlucration of Bullion, which he says was coin'd at the Mint ? Why, Sir, I'll tell you, it was carried abroad, as well as all the weighty Coin of the Kingdom, to pay the Balance of Trade, at that time so much against us.

So much for the Doctor. I will now examine what you have done towards confirming and establishing his Opinion, *that in those Days, we carried on a very profitable Traffick.*

Having

Having stated our native Product exported from the Port of <i>London</i> , according to <i>Davenant</i> , at ————	}	<i>l.</i> <i>s.</i> <i>d.</i> 2,022,812 : 04 : 00
---	---	--

And added One-Third more for the Out-ports (I suppose as a fix'd Pro- portion) ————	}	674,270 : 14 : 08
--	---	-------------------

Making together —	2,697,082 : 18 : 08
-------------------	---------------------

You then compute our Re- exports of foreign Pro- duct at the same amount	}	2,697,082 : 18 : 08
--	---	---------------------

Total of our Exports —	5,394,165 : 17 : 04
------------------------	---------------------

Thus, instead of losing near two Millions a Year, according to the Account of the Inspector-General, you make the Balance in our favour 39,382 *l.* 11 *s.* 4 *d.* by the extravagant Allowance made for Plantation and foreign Product re-exported. *But is it not ridiculous to any Gentleman at all versed in the State of our Commerce, to bear you gravely aver, that in the Year 1663, the foreign Commodities re-exported, were equal in Value to all the Manufactures and Commodities of our own Growth? And how is this made out? Why, say you, it appears by the Accounts quoted from the British Merchant, that our Exports of native Commodities in 1674, and of foreign Commodities in 1687, to France, were near equal: ergo, our foreign and native Product exported to all the World, were equal to one another in 1663. A*
most

most admirable Conclusion, indeed! But, Sir, by an Account of our Exports to *France* from the Port of *London* in the Year 1669, quoted p. 37, of your Letter, it appears, that our native Product amounted to 151,323*l.* 8*s.* and the foreign to 63,495*l.* 6*s.* 9*d.* only. Now as that Account contains the Exports of both native and foreign Product in the same Year; and, that too, much nearer the Period in question than the other, you ought to have computed the Amount of foreign and Plantation Goods exported *Anno* 1663 by that Proportion; and then their Amount would have been 1,125,238*l.* or thereabouts.

Again, if to the Exports of foreign Product from the Port of *London*, *Anno* 1669, you add One-Third more for the Out-ports; you will then have the Total of foreign Product from *England*, viz. 84,660*l.* 9*s.* which if you compare with the foreign Product *Anno* 1687, beforementioned, you will find an Increase of above 91,000*l.* *Sterl.* in 18 Years, which is above double; and allowing a proportional Increase from 1663 to 1669, the Total of foreign and Plantation Goods re-exported *Anno* 1663, will amount to no more than 723,367*l.* *Sterl.* or thereabouts. And this must appear to be near the Truth, to every one who considers, that so very early our Plantation Product was very inconsiderable, compared to what it was a little before the Revolution: which was the Case too of other foreign Commodities re-exported.

Then, Sir, the Account which you have given, Page 64, and 65, may be thus rectify'd.

Imports into the Port of <i>London</i> , 1663.	}	4016019 : 18 : 01	}	l. s. d. 5,354,793 : 04 : 00
d ^o . into the Out- ports $\frac{1}{3}$ more				

Exports of native Product 1663 from <i>England</i> d ^o . of planta- tion and foreign Product	}	2697082 : 18 : 87	}	3,420,449 : 18 : 08

The Balance	_____	<u>1,934,343 : 05 : 04</u>
-------------	-------	----------------------------

The Balance, according to the Inspector-General's Account	}	1,993,207 : 04 : 00

The Balance from the Ac- count rectify'd	}	1,934,343 : 05 : 04

The Difference	_____	<u>58,863 : 18 : 08</u>
----------------	-------	-------------------------

These two Balances so nearly agreeing, confirm one another; and, as I have already observed, fully justify the Authors of the *British Merchant*; who argue from *Davenant's Account*,

F

count, as from a true State of our general Trade, at those Periods of Time. One of those Authors in particular, after stating the Account of our Exports and Imports from the Inspector-General, for the Years 1663, and 1668, Vol. III. p. 314; and for the Years 1699, and 1703, p. 315, has, in Page 316, the following Observation :

“ 'Tis manifest, by the Medium of the former two Years, we lost by the Balance of our Trade 2,063,036 *l.* 6*s.* above two Millions, *per Ann.* when we consumed so great a Value of the Goods and Merchandizes of *France*; and that, by a Medium of the last two Years, when we consumed little of the Goods of *France*, and more of those of other Countries, we gain'd by our Trade with the whole World the Sum of 1,632,591 *l.* 19*s.* 9*d.* $\frac{3}{4}$ ”

And now, Sir, let me ask you, why, after admitting the Authority of the *British Merchant*, you find fault with the Author of the *Inquiry*, for saying the very same thing, that is here said in this Quotation?

I have been longer upon this than I intended: but, as you thought fit to charge the Author of the *Inquiry* with want of Judgment and Regard to Truth and Exactness, in stating the Inspector-General's Account; and as the Writers of the *British Merchant* are equally affected by that Charge, since he has their Authority for what he has done in that particular; I thought it but common Justice to vindicate from such an Imputation, those who had done such important Service to their Country.

I have

I have now dispatch'd your Objections; in which it is hard to say, whether you discover greater Malice, or Ignorance of the Subject. I take it for granted, your *Malice* is as heartily despis'd by the *Inquirer*, as your *Ignorance* wou'd be pitied by the *Publick*; was it not for that superlative Arrogance, and Self-conceit, which accompany it, and render your Performance so very offensive to every Gentleman. Here, Sir, I shou'd take my leave of you, if I was not afraid of incurring your Displeasure, by over-looking those curious Observations you made, *during a Three Years Continuance in France.*

In order, therefore, to recommend myself to your favour, and adorn my own Performance; I will take the liberty to repeat as many of them as you have thought fit to communicate: But, as they are of two sorts, it is necessary, for the sake of Method, to separate them.

The First, as seeming to imply a Contradiction, are above the Apprehension of vulgar Readers; though, at the same time they cannot fail to add a Lustre to your other Accomplishments in *Geography*, *Chronology*, *Philosophy*, and *Accounts*, in the opinion of Men of Science.

1. In the first place, you have observ'd, *That there is a more extensive Trade in France now, than formerly; but that the Effects of it are less general.*

2. *That though the Revenues be diminish'd, and Publick Credit destroy'd; yet the Resources of the French CROWN, in case of a War, are as great and as many as ever.*

The second sort, are such, as all Men must agree in ; the Truth of them being obvious to the meanest Understanding :

1. *That the NAVAL Strength of France, is what may be most hurtful to Britain in time of War : And the POSITION of that Strength is in her Sea-ports.*

2. *That the Declension of Lyons and Tours is easily remark'd, by those who make the tour of France ; but the flourishing state of her Sea-ports, can only be observed by those who visit them.*

3. *That the Inhabitants of the In-land Cities, since they lost their Manufactures, are not so subject to have them left upon their Hands, in case of a Prohibition in foreign Countries, as they were formerly ; and for the same Reason the Court is less troubled with their Complaints.*

4. *That the King of France has now plenty of Men for his Armies and Garrisons.*

NB. As a Confirmation of this, the Lieutenant-General of the *Police*, lately gave in a List to the Court, of near 70,000 lousy, idle Vagabonds in the City of *Paris* only : an undeniable Proof of the present flourishing state of *France*, and the great Resources of the French Crown.

The rest of your *Observations* upon *France*, I presume you think proper to keep by you, till you publish your *Travels*. I hope, whenever that happens, you will, at the same time, be pleased to explain that profound piece of political Wisdom, at the end of your Letter, from which the *Ministry* can receive no Light at present ; though it was undoubtedly design'd

sign'd for their Instruction. The Obscurity lies in the following Passage :

“ Under this Method (of assisting the Queen of Hungary with Money) we can easily *portion out* Assistance to the *Necessity* of the Service.”

What a vain Ostentation of Words is here, without the shadow of a Meaning ? Can they be of any possible use in directing Those who are to determine how much Money is necessary for that Queen's Support ? If not, then to what purpose is all you say, unless to *insinuate*, that sending Troops to *Flanders* is a very imprudent Step in the present Ministry ? To add some weight to this Opinion, you very sagely observe, that it is expedient to deliberate, before a War on the Continent is enter'd into ; because there may be some Difficulty in bringing it to an honourable Conclusion. How must it astonish Mankind, to see a *trivial* Politician, with such *peculiar Confidence and Weakness* assume the Airs of a Statesman, censure publick Measures, and, with a most ridiculous Gravity, dictate to Those, who direct the Councils of the Nation ?

Before I conclude, I beg Leave for a Moment, to contemplate you in the last Scene, acting a Part, for which Nature seems to have form'd you with peculiar Aptness.

Having discover'd, (p. 69, and 70.) that some Authors had been guilty of a most unheard-of Offence, by you call'd *Errantry* in *Accounts* ; which you have lately erected into a *Province*, and very modestly set up your Claim to the *Sovereignty* : You then proceed in the following Strain.

“ I have

“ I have, therefore, seiz’d this Offender, who
 “ seem’d to me eminently fearless and hardy ;
 “ and I have inflicted such Punishment on his
 “ *recreant Carcass*, as will be useful, I hope, in
 “ deterring his Brethren from the same sort of
 “ *Adventures*.”

So extraordinary a Feat in the very Infancy
 of your Knight-Errantry, is an *Earnest* to your
 Country, of what is justly to be expected from your
 Maturity. But, however diverting it might
 prove to the World, to see the Character of
 DON QUIXOTE reviv’d in your Person ; to
 see you become your own *Cervantes* ; or, if
 you please, your own *Druid* : for my part, when
 I perceive such violent Symptoms of Insanity,
 and approaching Madness ; I cannot help being
 moved to pity : And, therefore, I can no longer
 consider him as an Adversary, who is already
 become an Object of Compassion.

F I N I S.



